

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 16-19, and 21-26 are pending. Claims 1-13, and 16-19 are amended. Claims 14, 15, and 20 are cancelled. Claims 21-26 are newly added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner has returned signed electronic Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed October 14, 2003. However, the Examiner has neglected to acknowledge consideration of U.S. Patent No. 6,223,213 to Cleron et al. ("Cleron") by initialing the appropriate box. Applicant requests the Examiner to properly acknowledge consideration of Cleron by providing an initialed and signed electronic IDS.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12, 14-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Lazaridis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,464) in view of Schuetze (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,320). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, and 12

Independent claim 1 recites the feature of a database that stores at least one electronic message addressed to a first terminal device, and at least one scripting agent that accesses the database, retrieves the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device stored on the database, and processes the electronic message for transmission to a second terminal device, among other things. Independent claims 8 recites the feature of storing an electronic message in a database, accessing the database with a scripting agent to retrieve the electronic message, and processing the

electronic message with the scripting agent for transmission to the second terminal device, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, a server operating in a computer network system may receive an e-mail message addressed to a receiving client (see the Specification at page 5, lines 14-18). The e-mail message received by the server may be stored in an e-mail database (see the Specification at page 5, lines 15-19). After the e-mail message is stored in the e-mail database, a scripting agent may access the e-mail message and process the e-mail message based on predetermined instructions (see the Specification at page 5, lines 14, 15, and 19-21). The scripting agent may process the e-mail message based on a user profile or a receiving client profile such that the processed e-mail message may be received on a wireless client device, such as a pager device (see the Specification at page 5, lines 19-24).

Lazaridis appears to disclose an embodiment in which redirector software, located on a server, is configured to redirect messages addressed to a desktop system by forwarding the messages to a mobile data communication device (see Lazaridis at FIG. 2, and col. 9, lines 26-28). In the embodiment disclosed in Lazaridis, the server may be used to store the messages (see Lazaridis at col. 9, lines 33-35). However, in the system of Lazaridis, messages are redirected as they are received continuously and in real-time (see Lazaridis at col. 4, lines 57-60). Therefore, Lazaridis does not disclose a database that stores at least one electronic message addressed to a first terminal device, and at least one scripting agent that accesses the database, retrieves the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device stored on the database, and processes the electronic message for transmission to a second terminal device.

The Examiner admits that Lazaridis is deficient at least for failing to disclose a scripting agent that is adapted to configure the electronic message to appear in a format that corresponds to a user interface for an application that resides on a terminal associated with a recipient of the electronic message. The Examiner alleges that Schuetze teaches a mail exchange that is adapted to configure an electronic message to appear in a mail format that corresponds to a user interface of an organization for an application. Schuetze appears to disclose a system and method for exchanging

electronic mail between organizations having dissimilar electronic mail system (see Schuetze at the Abstract). Even if the Examiner's assertion with respect to Schuetze is accepted, Schuetze does not teach or suggest a database that stores at least one electronic message addressed to a first terminal device, and at least one scripting agent that accesses the database, retrieves the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device stored on the database, and processes the electronic message for transmission to a second terminal device.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that the prior art, both alone and in combination, fails to teach or suggest the invention of claims 1 and 8, and that claims 1 and 8 are allowable over the cited prior art. Further, claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 12 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 16, 17, and 19

These claims have been amended to depend from newly added claim 21, addressed below, and are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 4, 6, 11, 13, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lazaridis et al. and Wong and in further view of Woltz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,165). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the following basis.

Claims 4, 6, 11, and 13

The Examiner acknowledges that Lazaridis et al. and Schuetze do not disclose transmitting the electronic message (all or summary messages) to the wireless terminal device after the passage of a predetermined amount of time during which the electronic message has not been opened at the first terminal device, and relies on Woltz to teach this feature. Woltz appears to disclose generating different e-mail message formats to enable compatibility with various pager types (see col. 4, lines 16-29). Lazaridis et al., Schuetze, and Woltz, both alone and in combination, remain deficient, because they fail

to disclose or suggest a database that stores at least one electronic message addressed to a first terminal device, and at least one scripting agent that accesses the database, retrieves the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device stored on the database, and processes the electronic message for transmission to a second terminal device. Even if the Examiner's allegation with respect to Woltz is accepted, claims 4, 6, 11, and 13 depend from claims 1 and 8, and are therefore allowable over the cited prior art for the reasons addressed above.

Claim 18

This claim has been amended to depend from newly added claim 21, addressed below, and is believed to be allowable at least by virtue of its dependency.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 21-26 are added by this amendment and are distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Independent claim 21 recites the feature of a scripting agent that processes an electronic message addressed to a first terminal device for transmission to a second terminal device by creating a summary of the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device, among other things. Independent claim 24 recites the feature of processing an electronic message with a scripting agent for transmission to a second terminal device by creating a summary of the electronic message, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, a server operating in a computer network system may receive an e-mail message addressed to a receiving client (see the Specification at page 5, lines 14-18). A scripting agent located on the server may access the e-mail message and process the e-mail message for transmission to a wireless client device (see the Specification at page 5, lines 19-24). The receiving client and the wireless client device may both be associated with a common user. The scripting agent may process the e-mail message by composing a summary of the complete e-mail message before the summarized e-mail message is forwarded to the wireless client device (see

the Specification at page 10, lines 13). The scripting agent may summarize the e-mail message based at least in part on a profile available to the scripting agent (see the Specification at page 10, lines 14 and 15). The scripting agent may summarize the e-mail message based on predefined terms, based on the number of times words appear in the e-mail message, or based on user defined rules (see the Specification at page 10, lines 15-18).

In contrast, Lazaridis appears to disclose a system in which data items may be directed to a mobile device (see Lazaridis at the Abstract). Lazaridis appears to teach that in some embodiments the system may only direct a portion of the data item (see Lazaridis at col. 7, lines 8-11). However, Lazaridis merely suggests removing attached documents from the data item before direction to the mobile device (see Lazaridis at col. 7, line 64-col. 8, line 5, and at col. 13, lines 37-39), and does not disclose creating a summary of the data item. Therefore, Lazaridis is silent with respect to a scripting agent that processes an electronic message addressed to a first terminal device for transmission to a second terminal device by creating a summary of the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device.

The Examiner relies on Schuetze for a teaching of a mail exchange that is adapted to configure an electronic message to appear in a mail format that corresponds to a user interface of an organization for an application. Schuetze appears to disclose a system and method for exchanging electronic mail between organizations having dissimilar electronic mail system (see Schuetze at the Abstract). Schuetze does not disclose a scripting agent that processes an electronic message addressed to a first terminal device for transmission to a second terminal device by creating a summary of the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device. Even if the Examiner's assertion with respect to Schuetze is accepted, Schuetze, alone or in combination with Lazaridis, does not teach or suggest a scripting agent that processes an electronic message addressed to a first terminal device for transmission to a second terminal device by creating a summary of the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device.

The Examiner relies on Woltz for a teaching of transmitting the electronic message (all or summary messages) to the wireless terminal device after the passage of a predetermined amount of time during which the electronic message has not been opened at the first terminal device. Woltz appears to disclose generating different e-mail message formats to enable compatibility with various pager types (see col. 4, lines 16-29). Woltz does not disclose a scripting agent that processes an electronic message addressed to a first terminal device for transmission to a second terminal device by creating a summary of the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device. Even if the Examiner's assertion with respect to Woltz is accepted, Woltz, both alone and in combination with Lazaridis and/or Schuetze, fails to teach or suggest a scripting agent located on a server that processes an electronic message addressed to a first terminal device for transmission to a second terminal device by creating a summary of the electronic message addressed to the first terminal device.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that the cited prior art, both alone and in combination, fails to teach or suggest the invention of claims 21 and 24, and that claims 21 and 24 are allowable over the cited prior art. Further, claims 22, 23, 25, and 26 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Customer Number
29315

Application Serial No.: 09/481,511
Attorney Docket No.: 23452-087
Amendment accompanying RCE

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: August 18, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sean L. Ingram', is written over a horizontal line.

Customer Number
29315

Sean L. Ingram

Registration No.: 48,283

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND
POPEO P.C.

12010 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 900

Reston, Virginia 20190

703-464-4806

RES 119810v1